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1. **Systematic Literature Review (Study 1)**
	1. **Identification and screening**

To identify the determinants of support for the Black Lives Matter Movement, we conducted a state-of-the-art review. Eligible articles had to satisfy the following inclusion criteria: (1) to conduct research on attitudes towards the Black Lives Matter movement, including support for—and opinions about—the BLM movement; (2) to be published after the emergence of the BLM movement; and (3) to be written in the English language. To minimize the effects of publication bias (Harris et al 2013; Siddaway, Wood, and Hedges 2019), two independent reviewers performed the initial study identification, screening, and final determination of eligibility and inclusion.

The search was conducted on two academic databases, ‘Scopus’ and ‘Web of Science’ on 20th December, 2020. For both search engines (i.e., SCOPUS and Web of Science), the used keywords were “Black Lives Matter” AND (“attitudes” OR “support” OR “opinion”). Since research areas were labeled differently in each search engine, we chose the terms that best corresponded to the field of Humanities and Social Sciences. Specifically, for Scopus, the selected areas were Social Sciences, Psychology, and Art & Humanities, whereas for Web of Science selected areas were Sociology, Psychology, Psychology Social, Psychology Multidisciplinary, Ethnic Studies, Art, Political Science, Humanities Multidisciplinary, Communication, Cultural Studies, Social Sciences Interdisciplinary, Anthropology, History, and Social Issues. Table S1 shows the complete search query applied on Scopus and Web of Science databases for the systematic literature review.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table S1.** **Complete search query used for the systematic review.** |
| Database | Full search query |
| Scopus | (TITLE-ABS-KEY (black AND lives AND matter) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (attitude OR opinion OR attitudes)) AND PUBYEAR > 2013AND (LIMIT-TO (LANGUAGE , "English")) AND (LIMIT-TO ( SUBJAREA , "SOCI") OR LIMIT-TO (SUBJAREA , "ARTS") OR LIMIT-TO (SUBJAREA , "PSYC")) |
| Web of Science | ALL FIELDS: (black lives matter) AND ALL FIELDS: (attitudes OR opinion OR support)Refined by: RESEARCH AREAS: ( PSYCHOLOGY OR SOCIAL WORK OR SOCIOLOGY OR HISTORY OR ETHNIC STUDIES OR SOCIAL ISSUES OR SOCIAL SCIENCES OTHER TOPICS OR COMMUNICATION OR ARTS HUMANITIES OTHER TOPICS )Timespan: 2013-2021. |

The initial search for “Black Lives Matter” resulted in 1588 records in English from Scopus (593) and Web of Science (995). A total of 266 results remained upon filtering for the relevant research areas and for additional keywords (i.e., “attitudes”, “support”, or “opinion”). To attenuate the effect of publication bias and to ensure our results were not skewed due to coverage or restrictions of research areas, we cross-validated our literature search using Google Scholar (which also indexes preprint servers), with the term “Black Lives Matter” on 21st December, 2020, yielding one additional record not previously found in Scopus and Web of Science. As suggested by an anonymous reviewer, we attempted to actively identify unpublished work by performing an additional search on several preprint servers (i.e., OSF Preprints, SSRN, SocArXiv, APSA Preprints, AfricArXiv, MetaArXiv, ArXiv and PsyArXiv) on 14th December 2021, yielding one additional record.

Next, 32 records were excluded for being duplicates. The remaining records had their abstracts screened, and 199 records were removed because they either did not measure attitudes towards BLM or did not investigate determinants of support for BLM. Finally, the full-text of the remaining 37 records was analyzed in-depth and 16 additional records were excluded for not measuring attitudes towards BLM, resulting in a total of 21 records that met the inclusion criteria. Although our search did not feature any restrictions regarding unpublished manuscripts, dissertations, presentations, theses, and preprints, we did not identify unpublished work that fit the inclusion criteria of our systematic review. Hence, the final sample of records contained only peer-reviewed published articles.

Table S2 and table S3 show all the resources that were initially identified via Scopus and Web of Science, respectively. Tables S4 and S5 display the resources identified on Scopus and Web of Science after restricting for relevant research areas and tables S6 and S7 show the resources identified in both databases after filtering for the keywords “attitudes”, “support” and “opinion”. Table S8 shows all 236 resources that remained after the removal of duplicates. This table further indicates the 199 resources which were excluded after abstract screening for lack of variables measuring attitudes towards BLM or for not investigating determinants of support for BLM. Table S9 shows all articles that were full-text screened, divided into the ones that were included in (N=21) and excluded from the systematic review (N=16). Because of the size of these tables, they are not presented in this document, but can be found at OSF.

* 1. **Extraction of metadata**

Articles meeting the inclusion criteria were numbered from 1 to 21, following an alphabetical order according to the first author’s surname. When records contained more than one relevant study, each sample was considered independently and numbered accordingly, (e.g., S1.1 and S1.2 indicate two studies/samples ensuing from the first record). We extracted relevant metadata, including the author(s) names, title, year of publication, sample size, DOI, abstract, measures and predictors of BLM support, direction of effect-size, sample’s race and ethnicity, and the statistical technique used to assert about the p-value of the statistical inference. We extracted all results in the literature reporting predictors of BLM support amounting to 268 associations between support for BLM and a diverse set of predictors. We note that four associations—from S4 and S9, which are qualitative studies—were not statistically-tested. Significant relationships (*p* < 0.05) were coded as positive (‘+’) or negative (‘-’), and non-significant relationships (p ≥ 0.05) were coded as ‘ns.’. Table S10, available at OSF, shows the extracted metadata of all studies included in the systematic review. Note that whenever effect sizes were reported using more than one statistical method, we reported both. For example, when a study reported a correlation table containing bivariate relationships between constructs and a multiple regression table displaying conditional associations, we reported them both in Table S10. In Figure 2, we use the results of the most complex statistical analyses. For example, for the few articles (6 out of 21) reporting several regression models with increasing statistical complexity by incrementally adding controls, we use the results of the most complete model to prioritize robustness of findings.

We note that in the process of extracting studies’ metadata, we identified two studies which might have used the same data (Holt 2018; Holt and Sweitzer 2018). They were still included in the systematic review, as they focused largely on different predictors of support for BLM. Moreover, Holt (2018) focused on a general sample, while Holt and Sweitzer (2018) focused on results for White and African Americans subsamples. The only variable which was found in both studies (i.e., African Americans vs White Americans) was reported only once in order to avoid the risk of bias or double-dipping.

* 1. **Additional results**

Below, we describe results for some predictors of BLM support found in the systematic review, which were investigated across two or less studies.

***Religiosity***

The relationship between religiosity and support for the BLM movement was found to be non-significant across two studies investigating this variable (Bonilla and Tillery 2020; Updegrove et al. 2020).

***Ethnic social identity***

Two studies investigate ethnic racial identity (Holt and Sweitzer 2018; Merseth 2018), which is defined as one’s attachment to their racial group. Results suggest that the importance of ethnic social identity in shaping support for BLM depends on one’s race/ethnicity. Merseth (2018) asks respondents how important being Asian or Asian American is to how they see themselves. Results show that Asian Americans’ ethnic identity is not significantly related to BLM support. In addition, Holt and Sweitzer (2018) use the ethnic identity subscale of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney 1992) and find that ethnic identity is a positive and significant predictor of BLM support for African Americans, but not for Whites.

***Authoritarianism***

Only one study (Barker, Nalder and Newham 2020) out of the twenty-four reported the association between BLM support and authoritarianism, as measured by child-rearing items. A significant and negative association is reported, such that higher levels of authoritarianism are associated with lower support for the movement.

***Perceptions of social inequality***

Two studies investigate the association between individuals’ perceptions of inequality and support for BLM. Lake, Alston, and Kahn (2018) measured societal inequality using the awareness of privilege and oppression scale (McClellan 2014) and found that individuals who recognize social inequality are significantly more prone to support BLM. Likewise, using an equal opportunity questionnaire (Pratto et al. 1994), Holt (2018) reports that individuals who legitimize inequality through beliefs that all Americans have equal opportunities are less likely to support BLM, while those with positive attitudes towards racial policies to decrease inequality (e.g., Affirmative Action) are more likely to endorse the movement.

***Willingness for collective action (political participation)***

The association between support for BLM and traditional and non-traditional forms of political participation are inconsistent across studies. First, concerning traditional political participation, while Drakulich et al. (2020) find a non-significant association between voter turnout in the 2016 elections and BLM support, Towler, Crawford, and Bennett (2020) find a significant and positive association, such that those who reported to have voted in the 2016 elections or were confident to vote in the 2018 elections were more likely to identify with the movement. Drakulich et al. (2020) also report that feeling warm towards the BLM movement was significantly and positively associated with voter turnout for strong Democrats and significantly and negatively associated with voter turnout for strong Republicans. Similarly, feeling warm towards the movement is significantly and negatively associated with voting for Donald Trump in the 2016 elections (Drakulich et al. 2020).

Regarding non-traditional forms of political participation, Lake, Alston, and Kahn (2018) report that using social media to obtain and share information regarding policing in the United States is positively associated with BLM support. On the other hand, Towler, Crawford, and Bennett (2020) investigate a range of non-traditional political participation (e.g., signing petitions and donating to political causes) and find that most forms of non-traditional political participation are not significantly associated with identification with the BLM movement, with the exception of contacting a political representative, which is significantly and positively related to BLM identity.

1. **Multiple meta-analysis (Study 2)**
	1. **Search Methodology**

The search procedure is summarized below, and made available at the project’s OSF folder. We proceeded as follows: we searched for datasets at Roper’s iPoll that included the term “Black Lives Matter” and were dated from after the emergence of the BLM movement in 2013. The datasets indexed by the Roper Center are high-quality, vetted, probability and non-probability based nationally representative samples. The search yielded forty-four results, which are shown in Table S11, available at OSF. Upon restricting the search for downloadable datasets (raw data available), seventeen datasets remained (*N*=35,851). Our search did not feature any restrictions regarding language or country, but results were nonetheless composed solely of surveys in English with U.S. participants. We proceeded to download the raw data and its accompanying metadata. Codebooks were then screened. Three datasets were excluded because their BLM related questions did not tap into support (or lack thereof) for the BLM movement but rather whether respondents had knowledge about the movement, or saw it as offensive, or considered that BLM had brought attention to racial inequality in America. Additionally, upon inspecting the data, one additional dataset (ABC News/Washington Post Poll: July 2020 Coronavirus) was excluded because the variable measuring BLM support was not made available. Table S12 below shows the seventeen datasets identified at Roper’s iPoll which were downloadable, as well as the datasets we excluded from the multiple meta-analyses.

In the remaining thirteen datasets, the text of BLM-related questions measured support/opposition for the movement (*k*=8), favorability (*k*=4) and agreeability towards the movement (*k*=1). Despite some variability across datasets, these items were deemed to tap into individuals’ support of the movement. The thirteen datasets that fulfilled study-design criteria were included in the meta-analysis (see Table S12). The pooled sample size was *N* = 31,779, with individual sample sizes ranging from 1,001 to 9,487 respondents. Surveys were conducted in the following years: 2015 (*k*=2), 2016 (*k*=4), 2018 (*k*=3) and 2020 (*k*=4). Table S13, available at OSF, displays detailed information for each dataset.

We identified that one of the thirteen datasets, namely the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press 2016, was used in two studies included in the systematic review (Updegrove et al. 2020; Corral 2020). As the overlap between predictors was not substantial, this dataset was still included in the multiple meta-analysis.

* 1. ***Dependent variable***

In each dataset, the dependent variable was coded such that higher numbers were associated with greater support/favorability/agreeability towards BLM. Depending on how BLM support was measured in each dataset, the dependent variable was coded continuously on a 4 or 5-point Likert scale (k=4), or dichotomously (k=9).

* 1. ***Predictor variables***

We screened all datasets for common predictors. Table S14, available at OSF, shows the variables which were commonly identified across datasets. For each included predictor, we report the original question wording, as well as the original response options available to respondents. We also report how each variable was re-coded for the purpose of the multiple meta-analysis. Some variables were reverse-coded to reflect pro-trait in a construct. And cases in which respondents refused to answer, or did not have an opinion, or responded “don’t know” were coded as missing values. We note that some datasets presented different operationalizations of the same construct. Whenever this was the case, we opted for the variable which had (1) the least missing data, (2) response options that were more similar to corresponding variables in other datasets, and (3) more granular response options.

Our main goal was to test whether the associations found in the systematic review (Study 1) could be confirmed. The secondary goal was to uncover new and additional political and psychological determinants of support for BLM using a systematic approach to the consolidation of independent studies across time having distinct and independent investigators and survey specificities. We were able to identify thirty-seven predictors that were surveyed across at least three different datasets. Table S15, available at OSF, shows an overview of which datasets contained which of the third-seven identified predictors. This table also shows the available sample size per dataset, per predictor. Table S16 below shows for each of the third-seven predictors, one example of how it was worded and measured in one of the included datasets.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table S12. Downloadable datasets identified on The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research.** |  |
| **D** | **Study/Dataset** | **Year** | **APA** | **DOI** | **Sample Size** |
| **Included N=13** |
| 1 | 2018 Midterm Elections Survey - Wave 1 | 2018 | Enns, Peter K. and Jonathon P. Schuldt, Cornell University. (2018). 2018 Midterm Elections Survey - Wave 1 (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31115389 | 10.25940/ROPER-31115389 | 1379 |
| 2 | 2018 Midterm Elections Survey - Wave 3 | 2018 | Enns, Peter K. and Jonathon P. Schuldt, Cornell University. (2018). 2018 Midterm Elections Survey - Wave 3 (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31116762 | 10.25940/ROPER-31116762 | 1100 |
| 5 | CBS News/New York Times Poll: 2016 Presidential Campaign/Economy/Immigration/Police and Race Relations in the U.S. | 2016 | New York Times/CBS News. (2016). CBS News/New York Times Poll: 2016 Presidential Campaign/Economy/Immigration/Police and Race Relations in the U.S. (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31102964 | 10.25940/ROPER-31102964 | 1600 |
| 6 | CNN/Kaiser Family Foundation Poll: Survey of Americans on Race | 2015 | Kaiser Family Foundation/CNN. (2015). CNN/Kaiser Family Foundation Poll: Survey of Americans on Race (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31091628 | 10.25940/ROPER-31091628 | 1951 |
| 7 | CNN/ORC Poll: 2016 Presidential Debates/Trump’s Taxes/Racial Discrimination/Protests | 2016 | Cable News Network (CNN). (2016). CNN/ORC Poll: 2016 Presidential Debates/Trump’s Taxes/Racial Discrimination/Protests (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31095613 | 10.25940/ROPER-31095613 | 1501 |
| 8 | CNN/ORC Poll: 2016 Presidential Election/ Barack Obama Presidency/ Combat Operations Against ISIS/ 10-Year Review of Hurricane Katrina | 2016 | Cable News Network (CNN). (2015). CNN/ORC Poll: 2016 Presidential Election/ Barack Obama Presidency/ Combat Operations Against ISIS/ 10-Year Review of Hurricane Katrina (Version 3) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31095593 | 10.25940/ROPER-31095593 | 1001 |
| 9 | Kaiser Family Foundation Poll: June 2020 Kaiser Health Tracking Poll | 2020 | Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation. (2020). Kaiser Family Foundation Poll: June 2020 Kaiser Health Tracking Poll (Version 4) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31117492 | 10.25940/ROPER-31117492 | 1296 |
| 11 | NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist Poll: August 2020 | 2020 | PBS NewsHour/NPR. (2020). NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist Poll: August 2020 (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31117648 | 10.25940/ROPER-31117648 | 1261 |
| 12 | NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist Poll: September 2020 | 2020 | PBS NewsHour/NPR. (2020). NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist Poll: September 2020 (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31117708 | 10.25940/ROPER-31117708 | 1152 |
| 13 | Pew Research Center: 2016 Racial Attitudes in America III | 2016 | Pew Research Center. (2016). Pew Research Center: 2016 Racial Attitudes in America III (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31114971 | 10.25940/ROPER-31114971 | 3769 |
| 14 | Pew Research Center: American Trends Panel Wave 22 | 2016 | Pew Research Center. (2016). Pew Research Center: American Trends Panel Wave 22 (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31114184 | 10.25940/ROPER-31114184 | 4265 |
| 15 | Pew Research Center: American Trends Panel Wave 68 | 2020 | Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. (2020). Pew Research Center: American Trends Panel Wave 68 (Version 3) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31117491 | 10.25940/ROPER-31117491 | 9654 |
| 17 | Washington Post/Kaiser Family Foundation Poll: Survey on Political Rallygoing and Activism | 2018 | The Washington Post/Kaiser Family Foundation. (2018). Washington Post/Kaiser Family Foundation Poll: Survey on Political Rallygoing and Activism (Version 3) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31114982 | 10.25940/ROPER-31114982 | 1850 |
| **Removed N=4** |
| 3 | ABC News/Washington Post Poll: July 2020 Coronavirus | 2020 | Washington Post/ABC News. (2020). ABC News/Washington Post Poll: July 2020 Coronavirus (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31117566 | 10.25940/ROPER-31117566 | 1006 |
| 4 | Cards Against Humanity's Pulse of the Nation Poll: Public Issues Survey Wave 4 | 2017 | Cards Against Humanity. (2017). Cards Against Humanity's Pulse of the Nation Poll: Public Issues Survey Wave 4 (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31115223 | 10.25940/ROPER-31115223 | 800 |
| 10 | Monmouth University National Poll: July 2016 | 2016 | Monmouth University Polling Institute. (2016). Monmouth University National Poll: July 2016 (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31114031 | 10.25940/ROPER-31114031 | 805 |
| 16 | Taking America’s Pulse 2016 Class Survey | 2016 | Enns, Peter K. and Jonathon P. Schuldt, Cornell University. (2016). Taking America’s Pulse 2016 Class Survey (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. doi:10.25940/ROPER-31115251 | 10.25940/ROPER-31115251 | 1461 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table S16. Examples of items per predictor**  |
|  |  |  |
| **Dependent Variable** |
| Attitudes towards BLM |   | Do you support or oppose the movement called Black Lives Matter? |
|  |  |  |
| **Predictors** |
|  |  |  |
| **Demographics** |
| Age |   | What is your age? |
| Education |   | What was the last grade in school you completed? |
| Female (vs Male) |  | Respondent gender |
| Income |   | Last year, what was your total family income from all sources, before taxes?  |
| Urbanicity |  | - |
| Religiosity |   | What is your present religion, if any? Are you Protestant, Roman Catholic, Mormon, Orthodox such as Greek or Russian Orthodox, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, atheist, agnostic, something else, or nothing in particular? |
| Married (vs Single) |   | Are you currently married, living with a partner, widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never been married? |
| Employment (vs Retired) |   | What best describes your employment situation today? [Options followed] |
|  |  |  |
| **Race & Ethnicity** |
| Blacks (vs other races) |   | Which of the following describes your race? [Options followed] |
| Whites (vs other races) |   |
| Hispanics (vs other races) |   |
| Asians (vs other races) |   |
|  |  |  |
| **Partisanship & Ideology** |
| Republican (3-point PID) |   | In politics today, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, an Independent, or what? |
| Conservatism (3-point IID) |   | On most political matters, do you consider yourself liberal, moderate, or conservative? |
|  |  |  |
| **Voting Behavior & Political Attitudes** |
| Registered to vote |   | Are you registered to vote in your precinct or election district, or not? |
| Intention to vote |   | Do you plan to vote in the presidential election, have you already voted, or don’t you plan to vote? |
| Vote Intention for House of Representatives (Republicans vs Democrats) |   | If the election for the U.S. House of Representatives were being held today, would you vote for the Democratic candidate or the Republican candidate in your congressional district? |
| Trump Vote Intention 2020 (vs Biden) |   | Thinking about the upcoming presidential election, do you think you are definitely going to vote for Donald Trump, probably going to vote for Donald Trump, probably going to vote for Joe Biden, or are you definitely going to vote for Joe Biden? |
| Trump Vote Intention 2016 (vs Clinton) |   | If the 2016 presidential election were being held today and the candidates were (Hillary Clinton, the Democrat,) and (Donald Trump, the Republican,) would you vote for (Hillary Clinton) or (Donald Trump)? |
| Approval of Trump's Presidency |   | Do you approve or disapprove of the way Donald Trump is handling his job as President? |
| Approval of Obama's Presidency |   | Do you approve or disapprove of the way Barack Obama is handling his job as President? |
| Favorability towards Trump |   | We’d like to get your overall opinion of some people in the news. As I read each name, please say if you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of these people -- or if you have never heard of them. [ITEM DJT: Donald Trump] |
| Favorability towards Clinton |   | We’d like to get your overall opinion of some people in the news. As I read each name, please say if you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of these people -- or if you have never heard of them. [ITEM HRC: Hillary Clinton] |
| Biden's Handling of Racial Tensions (vs Trump) |   | Who do you think would better handle race relations as president: [Biden or Trump?] |
|  |  |  |
| **Attitudes towards Immigration** |
| Support for Building the Wall |   | Would you favor or oppose building a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border to try to stop illegal immigration? |
| Immigrants Take Jobs Away |   | How likely is it that recent immigration will take jobs away from people already here? |
| Illegal Immigrants should leave the U.S. |   | Which comes closest to your view about illegal immigrants who are living in the U.S.? [Options: They should be allowed to stay in the U.S. and apply for citizenship; They should be allowed to stay in the U.S., but not become citizens; They should be required to leave the U.S.] |
|  |  |  |
| **Racial Attitudes** |
| Racially Motivated Police Misconduct |   | Compared to white Americans, do you think Black Americans are (more likely) or (less likely) to experience police violence, or is there no difference? |
| Experienced Discrimination |   | Thinking about your own experience, have you ever experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly because of your race or ethnicity? |
| Blacks Are Discriminated against |   | How serious a problem do you think racial discrimination against blacks is in this country -- a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, not too serious or not at all serious? |
| Perceived Systematic Racism |   | Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class. |
| Racial Equality Protesting |   | Have you ever done any of the following, or not? -Attended a protest or rally that focused on issues related to race or racial equality |
| BLM Legitimacy |   | Thinking about what you have heard or seen about the demonstrations around the country in response to the actions of police against George Floyd in Minneapolis and Jacob Blake in Kenosha, Wisconsin, do you think the demonstrations are: [Options: Mostly legitimate protests; Mostly people acting unlawfully] |
| Race Relations Are Getting Better |   | Do you think race relations in the United States are getting better, getting worse or staying about the same? |
|  |  |  |
| **Economic Attitudes** |
| U.S. Economy is Going Well |   | How would you rate the condition of the national economy these days? Is it very good, fairly good, fairly bad, or very bad? |
| Optimism about U.S. Future |   | Overall, would you say you feel more (hopeful) or more (fearful) about the future of America? |
| Optimism about Personal Finances |   | When you think about your own personal finances over the next few months, do you feel very confident, somewhat confident, somewhat uneasy, or very uneasy? |

* 1. **Detailed results Multiple Meta-analyses**

**Demographics**

When it comes to demographics, effect-sizes are generally small in magnitude. Across thirteen datasets (N = 28,596), we find a negative association between age and BLM support (r = -0.11, 95% CI [-0.14, -0.09], p < .001, I2= 79%, t2= 0), suggesting that older individuals are less inclined to support the BLM movement than youngsters. Regarding gender, we find that females are more prone to support BLM than males (r = 0.13, 95% CI [0.11, 0.15], p < .001, I2= 71%, t2= 0, N = 28,742). In addition, we find a small but positive association between support for BLM and educational attainment (r = 0.1, 95% CI [0.06, 0.13], p < .001, I2= 80%, t2= 0, N = 28,645) and a negative association with income (r = -0.04, 95% CI [-0.07, -0.01], p = .008, I2= 74%, t2= 0, N = 27,115). Living in urban (vs non-urban) areas is positively associated with BLM support across seven datasets (r = 0.12, 95% CI [0.09, 0.14], p < .001, I2= 50%, t2= 0, N = 17,683). The small magnitudes of effect-sizes for demographic predictors can, at least in part, explain the high prevalence of non-significant associations identified in the systematic review between demographics and BLM support, especially in light of the fact that most studies reported contingent (as opposed to bivariate) relationships and were low-powered to detect small effect-sizes. In this sense, we note that the results of the meta-analyses often contrast with the findings of the systematic review. The meta-analyses results for gender and urbanicity, conversely, are in line with the findings from the majority of studies exploring these predictors in the systematic review.

Additionally, we identified three demographic predictors in the public opinion datasets which did not feature in the systematic review, namely employment status, marital status and religious affiliation. Data pooled from five datasets (N = 6,289) reveal that being employed (vs retired) is positively associated with supporting the BLM movement (r = 0.06, 95% CI [0.03, 0.08], p < .001, I2= 0%, t2= 0). From all demographic predictors, the two largest effect-sizes are attributed to religious affiliation and marital status. Subscribing to a religion (r = -0.18, 95% CI [-0.23, -0.13], p < .001, I2= 90%, t2= 0, N = 17,615) or being married as opposed to being single (r = -0.1,8 95% CI [-0.21, -0.16], p < .001, I2= 52%, t2= 0, N = 15,944) are negatively correlated with BLM support.

**Race and Ethnicity**

 The magnitude of the relationship between race/ethnicity and support for the BLM movement tends towards the medium size. Pooling data from thirteen datasets (N = 26,954), we find that self-identifying as Black (vs other races/ethnicities: Whites, Asians and Hispanics) is a positive predictor of BLM support (r = 0.23, 95% CI [0.2, 0.26], p < .001, I2= 81%, t2= 0). Conversely, being White (vs Blacks, Asians and Hispanics) is negatively associated with supporting the BLM movement (r = -0.2, 95% CI [-0.23, -0.17], p < .001, I2= 86%, t2= 0, N = 26,954). These results are generally consistent with the findings from the systematic review, which showed that Blacks are more prone to support the movement than Whites (Holt and Sweitzer 2018; Updegrove et al. 2020; Wouters 2019) and that Whites are less inclined to support BLM than racial minorities (Ilchi and Frank 2020; Lake, Alston, and Kahn 2018; Selvanathan, Lickel, and Jetten 2020). Identifying as Asian (vs Blacks, Whites and Hispanics) is positively associated with support for BLM across eight datasets (r = 0.04, 95% CI [0.02, 0.05], p < .001, I2= 0%, t2= 0, N = 16,752). Hispanics, when compared to Blacks, Whites and Asians, do not significantly show more or less support for the BLM movement (r = 0.03, 95% CI [-0.00, 0.05], p = .09, I2= 76%, t2= 0, N = 26,954).

**Partisanship and Ideology**

The associations between partisanship, ideology and BLM support were large in magnitude. Consistent with the results of the systematic review (Arora and Stout 2019; Corral 2020; Merseth 2018; Updegrove et al. 2020; Wouters 2019), we find that, across thirteen datasets (N = 25,696), identifying with the Republican party is negatively associated with BLM support, suggesting Republicans are less likely to support the movement than Independents or Democrats (r = -0.52, 95% CI [-0.57, -0.46], p < .001, I2= 97%, t2= 0.01). Likewise, across eleven datasets (N = 26,164), we find that the higher the conservatism, the smaller is the support for the BLM movement (r = -0.46, 95% CI [-0.52, -0.4], p < .001, I2= 98%, t2= 0.01). This finding is also in agreement with the results of the systematic review (Barker, Nalder, and Newham 2020; Merseth 2018; Updegrove et al. 2020).

**Voting behavior and political attitudes**

 Across seven datasets (N = 17,370), we find that the average magnitude of the effect of being registered to vote on support for the BLM movement is non-significant (r = -0.03, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.00], p = .052, I2= 61%, t2= 0). We also find that intention to vote, is not a significant predictor of BLM support across four datasets (r = -0.03, 95% CI [-0.09, 0.04], p = .43, I2= 89%, t2= 0, N =7,355). Importantly, intention to vote for specific candidates or parties is a much stronger predictor of BLM support. Across three datasets (N =3,640) we find that intention to vote for Republican candidates (vs Democratic candidates) in the U.S. House of Representatives is negatively associated with support for the BLM movement (r = -0.65, 95% CI [-0.68, -0.61], p < .001, I2= 73%, t2= 0). Similarly, and consistently with the results of Drakulich et al. (2020), individuals who would vote for Donald Trump in the 2016 elections are less likely to support the BLM movement than those aiming to vote for Hillary Clinton (r = -0.63, 95% CI [-0.73, -0.53], p < .001, I2= 98%, t2= 0.01, N =5,509). We find that those who intended to vote for Donald Trump in the 2020 elections were less likely to support the BLM movement than those intending to vote for current President Joe Biden (r = -0.72, 95% CI [-0.83, -0.6], p < .001, I2= 97%, t2= 0.01, N =2,714).

 Approval of Donald Trump’s presidency, as well as favorability towards Donald Trump are also strong predictors of lack of support for the BLM movement. Across six datasets (N =7,473), we find that the more individuals approve Trump’s presidency the less likely they are to support the BLM movement (r = -0.64, 95% CI [-0.69, -0.59], p < .001, I2= 93%, t2= 0). Likewise, individuals holding favorable opinions of Donald Trump are less prone to support the BLM movement across three datasets (r = -0.48, 95% CI [-0.65, -0.32], p < .001, I2= 96%, t2= 0.02, N =2,780). In stark contrast, results of three datasets (N =3,031) indicate that approval of Barack Obama’s presidency is positively associated with support for the BLM movement (r = 0.57, 95% CI [0.51, 0.64], p < .001, I2= 87%, t2= 0), as well as holding favorable opinions of Hillary Clinton (r = 0.53, 95% CI [0.44, 0.62], p < .001, I2= 93%, t2= 0.01, N =2,777). Finally, results of three datasets (N =3,123) show that individuals who trust President Joe Biden to do a better job than Donald Trump in handling race relations in the U.S. are more prone to support the BLM movement (r = 0.66, 95% CI [0.55, 0.77], p < .001, I2= 96%, t2= 0.01).

**Attitudes towards Immigration**

 Attitudes towards immigration are also strong predictors of support for the BLM movement. Results of four datasets (N =5,299) suggest that the more individuals support “building the wall” to stop illegal immigration, the less likely they are to support the BLM movement (r = -0.58, 95% CI [-0.64, -0.51], p < .001, I2= 92%, t2= 0). Moreover, the more individuals believe that illegal immigrants should be required leave the country, the less they support the BLM movement (r = -0.46, 95% CI [-0.51, -0.42], p < .001, I2= 76%, t2= 0, N = 12,957). Across three datasets (N =3,507) we also find that the more individuals think that immigrants take jobs away from Americans, the less they support the BLM movement (r = -0.38, 95% CI [-0.48, -0.28], p < .001, I2= 92%, t2= 0.01).

**Racial attitudes**

We find that the influence of racial attitudes on support for the BLM movement varies. Beliefs on racially motivated police misconduct are strong predictors of support for the BLM movement, alongside perceptions that Blacks are discriminated against and perceptions of systemic racism. Individuals who believe Black people are more likely to experience police brutality are more prone to support the movement (r = 0.45, 95% CI [0.34, 0.56], p < .001, I2= 94%, t2= 0.01, N =3,503). This result resonates with two (out of three) studies investigating police misconduct in the systematic review (Ilchi and Frank 2020; Updegrove et al. 2020). Similarly, across three datasets (N =4,261), we find that the more individuals believe that Blacks are discriminated against, the more they support the BLM movement (r = 0.47, 95% CI [0.30, 0.63], p < .001, I2= 98%, t2= 0.02). This result also supports the findings of the systematic review (Corral 2020; Merseth 2018; Wouters 2019). In addition, those individuals who believe systemic racism exists in the U.S. are more prone to support the BLM movement (r = 0.46, 95% CI [0.24, 0.69], p < .001, I2= 99%, t2= 0.05, N = 5,020). We also find that individuals who believe the BLM demonstrations to be legitimate are more in favor of the movement (r = 0.52, 95% CI [0.29, 0.75], p < .001, I2= 100%, t2= 0.05, N = 12,462) as well as individuals reporting to have attended protests in favor of racial equality and against police brutality (r = 0.26, 95% CI [0.2, 0.31], p < .001, I2= 54%, t2= 0, N = 10,392).

Conversely, we find that having personally experienced discrimination is not a significant predictor of BLM support (r = 0.07, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.16], p = .15, I2= 97%, t2= 0.01, N =14,634). This result is consistent with the findings stemming from the systematic review, according to which the association between previous experiences of discrimination and BLM support are mostly non-significant (Corral 2020; Updegrove et al. 2020; Watson-Singleton et al. 2020). Lastly, across four datasets (N =8,286) we find that the perception that race relations are getting better in the U.S. (as opposed to getting worse or staying about the same) is associated with more support for the BLM movement (r = 0.13, 95% CI [0.05, 0.21], p = .001, I2= 91%, t2= 0.01).

**Economic Attitudes**

 We find that optimism about the future of the United States is not significantly associated with BLM support (r = 0.06, 95% CI [-0.29, 0.21], p = .74, I2= 99%, t2= 0.13, N =4,680), nor is optimism about one’s own personal financial situation (r = -0.01, 95% CI [-0.09, 0.08], p = .88, I2= 94%, t2= 0.01, N =9,638). Conversely, across three public opinion surveys (N =6,049), all of which were conducted in 2016 during Obama’s presidency, we find that the more individuals believe the U.S. economy is going well, the more they support the BLM movement (r = 0.36, 95% CI [0.23, 0.49], p < .001, I2= 96%, t2= 0.01).

* 1. **Detailed methods and results for the Subgroup Analyses**

The accurate estimation of probabilities at the population level necessitates not high sample sizes but the quality of data via its statistical representativeness of the target population (Bradley et al. 2021). As most data from Study 2 ensue from nationally representative probability samples, as far as data quality is concerned, these are particularly suitable for this endeavor (see Table S13 for a breakdown of sample types). However, despite uniformity in methodology, these data span a period of more than 4 years (2016-20) in which BLM support saw considerable heterogeneity in time (see Chudy and Jefferson 2021). Such large heterogeneity is also corroborated in the multiple meta-analyses (see I2 estimates in Figure 3). For this reason, we compared our estimates with CIVIQS trendlines on BLM support for registered voters, finding largely agreement on race, gender, partisanship, and education. Nonetheless, we caution that our estimates—whilst relative proportions might be accurate—likely overestimate current support for BLM in the American population. This might be the case especially among conservatives and Republicans, as the intense politicization of race-related topics in the 2020’s general election (e.g., heightened salience of white identity, riots vs protests, defunding/abolishing the police, critical race theory, project 1619, and BLM) may have negatively impacted support for BLM.

Methodologically, our operationalization was straightforward. We dichotomized our dependent variable into opposing vs supporting BLM, aggregated datasets having common groups and subgroups whenever possible, and calculated the (simple) probability of support. Overall, we were able to identify 11 societal groups—age, education, employment status, gender, ideological orientation, income, marital status, partisanship, race, religious affiliation, and urbanicity— and 53 comprising subgroups. Table S17 shows the aggregation rules for each of the eleven societal groups identified. We report, for each dataset, which societal groups and subgroups were present and how they were originally coded. Row 5 of the table shows how each subgroup was recoded for the purpose of the subgroup analysis.

We present results in percentages to facilitate interpretation. All discussed results are statistically significant (p < 0.001), even when correcting for multiple comparisons. Table S18 below displays, the size of each societal subgroup, as well as the absolute frequency and percentage of BLM support within each subgroup.

In line with our meta-analytical results, we still observe that females, employed individuals, and those living in metropolitan areas are more prone to support BLM than males, retired and individuals living in non-metropolitan areas, respectively. Similarly, the smallest differences in BLM support are between income levels, displaying a rather uniform pattern.

Altogether, while the meta-analyses indicate what are the most consistent and robust predictors of BLM support across datasets, this analysis reveals that subgroups are also of importance. For example, we unveil considerable differences in BLM support across religious groups and also show that while racial/ethnic minorities show more support for BLM than whites, there is still substantial variation among minorities in terms of BLM support.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table S18. BLM support per subgroup** |
| **Group** | **Subgroup** | **Percentage of BLM support** | **Frequency of BLM support** | **Frequency [Total]** |
| Age | 18-29 | 68.69697 | 2267 | 3300 |
| 30-49 | 56.70181 | 3765 | 6640 |
| 50-64 | 48.96746 | 3296 | 6731 |
| 65+ | 47.62498 | 3058 | 6421 |
| Education | Less than High School | 49.37429 | 434 | 879 |
| High School | 46.28833 | 1721 | 3718 |
| Some college, no degree | 49.82891 | 3495 | 7014 |
| College | 55.72315 | 3953 | 7094 |
| Post-Grad | 62.43274 | 3249 | 5204 |
| Employment | Working/Employed | 67.60427 | 697 | 1031 |
| Not Working/Not Employed | 63.71598 | 2692 | 4225 |
| Disabled | 61.15702 | 222 | 363 |
| Retired | 55.8651 | 762 | 1364 |
| Gender | Male | 47.24298 | 6006 | 12713 |
| Female | 60.17407 | 7467 | 12409 |
| Ideology | Liberal | 83.66455 | 5936 | 7095 |
| Moderate | 56.03715 | 4525 | 8075 |
| Conservative | 21.37866 | 1591 | 7442 |
| Income | Less than 30k | 57.24655 | 2366 | 4133 |
| 30k-50k | 53.32933 | 1778 | 3334 |
| 50k-75k | 53.85517 | 1837 | 3411 |
| 75k | 52.47423 | 5090 | 9700 |
| Marital Status | Married | 52.01741 | 4899 | 9418 |
| Widowed | 52.19966 | 617 | 1182 |
| Divorced | 60.37285 | 1263 | 2092 |
| Separated | 65.94005 | 242 | 367 |
| Living with partner | 69.80392 | 890 | 1275 |
| Single/Never Married | 73.21477 | 2676 | 3655 |
| Party ID | Democrat | 77.75371 | 7179 | 9233 |
| Independent | 49.96499 | 3568 | 7141 |
| Republican | 23.74262 | 1487 | 6263 |
| Something else | 47.70492 | 873 | 1830 |
| Race | White Americans | 47.27028 | 8087 | 17108 |
| Latinos | 58.09834 | 1607 | 2766 |
| Asian Americans | 70.58824 | 228 | 323 |
| African Americans | 82.33654 | 2657 | 3227 |
| Religious Affiliation | Roman Catholic | 41.17428 | 1108 | 2691 |
| Protestant | 42.8263 | 2579 | 6022 |
| Jewish | 58.56481 | 253 | 432 |
| Other | 60.70111 | 658 | 1084 |
| None | 70.03645 | 2882 | 4115 |
| Urbanicity | Non-Metropolitan area | 46.2522 | 1049 | 2268 |
| Metropolitan area | 58.70367 | 7001 | 11926 |

* 1. **Multivariate Regressions**

To control for significant fluctuation in coefficients of correlated variables, we conducted a series of regularized regressions to identify a subset of predictors that exhibited the most robust effects via elastic nets (Zou & Hastie, 2005). Whenever this machine-learning technique identifies a robust predictor across its iterations, we collected and plotted them in Figure S1, which, like Figure 5 (Panel A), plots the counts of how many times a predictor was available in a dataset, how many times it was deemed to be ‘robust’ by the Elastic Net algorithm, and how many times it was a significant predictor in a multivariate linear regression controlling for other variables. Table S19, available at OSF, shows an overview of each variables were controlled for in each of the models/datasets.
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